BEFORE

THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF

SOUTH CAROLINA

OCTOBER 26, 1995

IN RE: Application of South Carolina Electric) ORDER & Gas Company for an Increase in its) RULING ON Electric Rates and Charges.) PRE-HEARING) MOTIONS

This matter comes before the Public Service Commission of South Carolina (the Commission) on several pre-hearing Motions filed by several parties in this South Carolina Electric & Gas Company (SCE&G or the Company) electric rate case Docket.

The first Motion is made by SCE&G, and it is a Motion to sever any issues regarding land transfers of SCE&G. The Company proposes that these matters be addressed in Docket No. 89-230-E/G. The Company notes that this Docket was set up by the Commission to deal with issues involving land transfers and affiliate transactions of SCE&G.

The Commission recalls the complexity of this Docket, and the land transfer and affiliate transaction issues, and therefore grants the Motion to Sever.

Second, the Consumer Advocate for the State of South Carolina (the Consumer Advocate) has moved to set a time and date certain for the testimony of Allan I. Schwartz, a witness for the Consumer Advocate in this Docket. The Consumer Advocate notes that,

because of a prior commitment, Schwartz is only available to testify on November 7th, or on the morning of November 8, 1995. The Consumer Advocate requests the Commission set a time and date certain for Schwartz's testimony in accordance with his availability.

The Commission has considered this matter, and believes that this, and any other Motions to set times and dates certain for any other witnesses should be denied. The Commission attempts to be reasonable in situations where witnesses request days certain to testify. However, in a large rate case such as this one, such scheduling becomes very awkward, and at times may interrupt the orderly flow of testimony in the case. We therefore believe that this Motion, and any other Motions to set times and dates certain for any witnesses must be denied. We believe that this will promote more orderly administration of the case.

Finally, SCE&G moves to set a specific hearing schedule for the week of November 6, 1995, and also, to set briefs thirty (30) days from the end of the hearing, regardless of the availability of transcripts.

With regard to the scheduling of the hearing during the week of November 6th, the Commission believes that it must maintain the flexibility to schedule as it wishes to orderly administer the hearing in this matter. The Commission therefore denies this portion of the Motion. The Commission would note that, should briefs be allowed, the Commission has a Regulation (R.103-875(A)) which governs the timing of the briefs, unless the

DOCKET NO. 95-1000-E - ORDER NO. 95-1629 OCTOBER 26, 1995 PAGE 3

Commission chooses to waive that Regulation. We do not choose to waive the Regulation at this time.

This Order shall remain in full force and effect until further Order of the Commission.

BY ORDER OF THE COMMISSION:

Rudolf Mittell

ATTEST:

Executive Director

(SEAL)